

Wgarner1@hotmail.com



first batch

From: **Dan Patrick** (danpatrick700@gmail.com)
Sent: Thu 3/29/12 12:49 AM
To: Logan Spence (loganspence@hotmail.com)

Logan,

I sent you the first batch of anything I had that mentioned Voter ID. Let me know how many you received as the internet signal is not the best at sea. I will send more later.
Don't forget to include any e-blasts, or Capital updates we sent out that mentioned Voter ID.

Thanks
Dan

Fwd: Follow up on meeting and In Georgia, a Victory for Citizenship Verification

From: **Dan Patrick** (danpatrick700@gmail.com)
Sent: Thu 3/29/12 12:55 AM
To: Logan Spence (loganspence@hotmail.com)

2:13-cv-193
09/02/2014

DEF0762

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Dan Patrick** <danpatrick700@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Aug 29, 2010 at 12:04 AM
Subject: Follow up on meeting and In Georgia, a Victory for Citizenship Verification
To: Brian and Mel Birdwell <brianandmelbirdwell@msn.com>, Dan Patrick <danpatrick700@gmail.com>, Duella <bobduella@tx.rr.com>, Estes <estes@estesinc.com>, Florence Shapiro <florencesapiro@hotmail.com>, "glennhegar@aol.com" <glennhegar@aol.com>, Jane Nelson <jnelsons@sbcglobal.net>, Jeff Wentworth <jwentworth@austin.rr.com>, Joan Huffman <jlawyer119@aol.com>, John Carona <jcarona@associaonline.com>, Kel Seliger <kseliger@lakesteel.com>, Kelvin Eltife <kptyl@aol.com>, Mike Jackson <mike.jackson@forcecorp.net>, "Opie@cdmlaw.com" <opie@cdmlaw.com>, Robert Nichols <rnichols55@aol.com>, "steveogden@ogdenresources.com" <steveogden@ogdenresources.com>, "tommy williams@usa.net" <tommy.williams@usa.net>, Troy Fraser <tfraser@nctv.com>

Senators,

I thought our two days was very beneficial and look forward to the next meeting. We accomplished a lot, learned a lot, and as a good friend of mine likes to say, we got a few skunks out on the table and discussed in a frank and candid manner. I know we all greatly appreciate Bob putting this together.

As to the discussion at breakfast about Independent Conservative group, I thought the ideas suggested by Fraser, Duncan, Eltife, Huffman and others, and accepted by me, will only make the group stronger. "A man who seeks the wise counsel of others leads to greater wisdom on his part,".....somebody must have said this, and if not, they should have.

In view of our discussion on voter ID and immigration, several of you mentioned you thought that the two issues were one in the same,

or at a minimum connected. I think this story out of Georgia makes that point.

Dan

In Georgia, a Victory for Citizenship Verification

Link: <http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/244949/georgia-victory-citizenship-verification-hans-von-spakovsky>

By Hans A. von Spakovsky

August 27, 2010 11:04 A.M.

Last week brought good news for those of us who believe that illegal aliens and non-citizens shouldn't be violating federal and state laws that prohibit them from registering and voting with impunity. The Justice Department agreed to settle a federal lawsuit filed by the State of Georgia (*Georgia v. Holder*) that will allow Georgia to verify the citizenship status of newly registered voters.

Georgia filed the lawsuit in June because the DOJ objected to the state's verification procedures, calling Georgia's process "seriously flawed" and claiming it would have a disparate impact on minority voters. Because Georgia is covered by Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, it cannot make any change in its voting laws and procedures without first getting the approval of the Civil Rights Division, the most notoriously partisan division in the Justice Department.

There's an irony here: By verifying citizenship, Georgia was simply implementing another federal law, the Help America Vote Act of 2002, which requires states to verify the accuracy of voter registration information.

The Justice Department had not even filed an answer to the complaint before it agreed to settle. When the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division first objected to Georgia's verification process, sources told me that it had virtually no supporting evidence. Instead, the objection was driven by the ideology of the lawyers handling the Section 5 review process, including Deputy Chief Bob Berman. They wanted to please their allies in the liberal advocacy world, such as the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund and La Raza, which object to such verification and were gambling that Georgia would just accept the objection. They were very worried that if Georgia sued, the Division would lose the case in court.

Apparently, the Justice Department lawyers handling the case were so eager to settle that they agreed to approve Georgia's verification process after the state agreed to make a trivial change in its procedures. In fact, the Division precleared the new procedure under Section 5 within a day of receiving the submission from Georgia and has now asked the federal court (in conjunction with Georgia) to dismiss the lawsuit.

The minimal change made by Georgia and accepted by DOJ was just a face-saving measure to allow the Justice Department lawyers to claim that Georgia has corrected the supposedly "discriminatory" problems in its verification process. Consider an amusing motion objecting to the preclearance and the dismissal filed by the Georgia Association of Latino Elected Officials and Concerned Black Clergy of Atlanta. The motion says these organizations intervened "because the position of the United States [on Section 5 matters] is subject to change, sometimes very suddenly." The motion complains about the Justice Department approving Georgia's "changed" verification process within one day of receiving it, particularly because the supposedly changed procedure is "substantially similar" to what Justice originally found objectionable.

The motion filers are correct: Justice changed its mind very suddenly when faced with a lawsuit demanding that it produce evidence that the citizenship-verification process was somehow "discriminatory." And it ended up preclearing a verification process virtually indistinguishable from Georgia's original procedures.

Unfortunately, this saga is not yet over, but Georgia has certainly won the first round, **demonstrating how successful states can be when they have the courage to fight completely unjustified actions taken by the Civil Rights Division.**

But the second round is coming soon. While this case involved verifying the citizenship of registered voters, **Georgia also passed a new law recently that requires anyone registering to vote to provide proof of citizenship before the registration will be processed.** Most likely, Georgia will file a lawsuit to ask a judge to declare this law acceptable under Section 5 rather than submit themselves to the ideological and partisan vagaries of an administrative review by the Civil Rights Division. They should win that lawsuit as well — assuming DOJ doesn't fall over itself to settle the suit as soon as it's filed.

More on this subject if interested:

John Fund, WSJ: http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704147804575455672011604734.html?mod=gooqlenews_wsj

ELECTION LAW BLOG
by Rick Hasen

Joint Motion to Dismiss in Ga. v. Holder Section 5 Case; MALDEF and LDF Want to Intervene

Via Dan Tokaji and Moritz comes this joint motion to dismiss from DOJ and the state of Georgia and this motion to intervene from civil

rights organizations opposed to dismissal. Very interesting developments, about which I hope to hear more from those who know the back story.

Posted by Rick Hasen at 12:18 PM

Fwd: Don't talk about Dewhurst killing Voter Photo ID????

From: **Dan Patrick** (danpatrick700@gmail.com)
Sent: Thu 3/29/12 12:09 PM
To: Logan Spence (loganspence@hotmail.com)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Dan Patrick** <danpatrick700@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Oct 15, 2008 at 1:42 AM
Subject: Re: Don't talk about Dewhurst killing Voter Photo ID????
To: Edd Hendee <eddchendee@gmail.com>

I'll buy next week one day...

On Tue, Oct 14, 2008 at 6:19 AM, Edd Hendee <eddchendee@gmail.com> wrote:

With all the stories of voter fraud, dead people voting in Harris County, ACORN nationwide....and I can't explain why our votes are not protected?

This one is going to cost you lunch as you explain it to me. :-)

Edd

--

Edd C. Hendee
eddchendee@gmail.com

Fwd: Voter ID Was a Success in November

From: **Dan Patrick** (danpatrick700@gmail.com)
Sent: Thu 3/29/12 12:11 PM
To: Logan Spence (loganspence@hotmail.com)
1 attachment
wsj_print.gif (2.1 KB)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **AJ** <a12i02@sbccglobal.net>
Date: Sat, Jan 31, 2009 at 5:48 PM
Subject: Voter ID Was a Success in November
To: Dan Patrick <danpatrick700@gmail.com>

Dan,

I'm sure you have seen this, but if not here it is. This is an important article with strong implications for Texas. It was in Friday's WJS.

AJ

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
WSJ.com

• JANUARY 30, 2009

Voter ID Was a Success in November

Turnout was higher in states that took a simple step to prevent fraud.

•
By HANS VON SPAKOVSKY

Remember the storm that arose on the political left after the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of Indiana's voter ID law last April? According to the left, voter ID was a dastardly Republican plot to prevent Democrats from winning elections by suppressing the votes of minorities, particularly African-Americans.

Since the election of Barack Obama, we haven't heard a word about such claims. On Jan. 14, the federal appeals court in Atlanta upheld Georgia's voter ID law.

The reasons for the silence about alleged voter suppression is plain. In the first place, numerous academic studies show that voter ID had no effect on the turnout of voters in prior elections. The plaintiffs in every unsuccessful lawsuit filed against such state requirements could not produce a single individual who didn't either already have an ID or couldn't easily get one.

Second are the figures emerging from the November election. If what liberals claimed was true, Democratic voters in states with strict photo ID requirements would presumably have had a much more difficult time voting, and their turnout dampened in comparison to other states. Well, that myth can finally be laid to rest.

The two states with the strictest voter ID requirements are Indiana and Georgia. Both require a government-issued photo ID. According to figures released by Prof. Michael McDonald of George Mason University, the overall national turnout of eligible voters was 61.6%, the highest turnout since the 1964 election.

The Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies (JCPES) found that black turnout in the 2008 election was at a historic high, having increased substantially from 2004. The total share of black voters in the national vote increased from 11% to 13% according to exit polls, with 95% of blacks voting for Mr. Obama.

So what happened in Georgia where the ACLU, the NAACP and other such groups claimed the state's photo ID law was intended to depress black turnout? According to figures released by Curtis Gans at American University, Georgia had the largest turnout in its history, with nearly four million voters. The Republican turnout was up only 0.22 percentage points; the Democratic turnout was up an astonishing 6.1 percentage points, rising from 22.66% of the eligible voting population to 28.74% of the eligible population.

The overall turnout in Georgia increased 6.7 percentage points from the 2004 election – the second highest increase in turnout of any state in the country. According to the JCPES, the black share of the statewide vote increased in Georgia from 25% in the 2004 election, when the photo ID law was not in effect, to 30% in the 2008 election, when the photo ID law was in effect.

By contrast, the Democratic turnout in the neighboring state of Mississippi – which has no voter ID requirement but also has a large black population similar to Georgia's -- increased by only 2.35 percentage points.

In Indiana, which the Supreme Court said had the strictest voter ID law in the country, the turnout of Democratic voters in the November election increased by 8.32 percentage points. That was the largest increase in Democratic turnout of any state in the country. The increase in overall turnout in Indiana was the fifth highest in the country, but only because the turnout of Republican voters actually went down 3.57 percentage points. The nearby state of Illinois (no photo ID requirement) had an increase in Democratic turnout of only 4.4 percentage points -- nearly half Indiana's increase.

Of course, the decline in Republican turnout and huge increase in Democratic turnout in Indiana matched what happened elsewhere, and explains why Mr. Obama won. Republican turnout nationwide declined 1.3 percentage points from the 2004 election, while Democratic turnout increased 2.6 percentage points.

The JCPES predicts that when the final turnout numbers are in for the 2008 election, black turnout will probably reach a historic high of almost 67% and likely surpass white turnout for the first time. All at a time when about half of the states have passed various forms of voter ID requirements, including two states with strict photo ID laws.